

**REMARKS**

The present Amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed October 21, 2004.

In the Office Action, claims 9 and 25-27 are objected to for minor informalities. Claims 9, 24 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Claims 1-4, 6-22, 24-25 and 28-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Hawkins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,318 B1). Claims 5 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hawkins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,343,318 B1) in view of Dutta et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,615,212 B1). Claims 1-38 are currently pending.

Claims 9 and 25-27 have been amended to the correct minor informalities most helpfully identified by the Examiner.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph**

Claims 9 and 30 have been amended to replace the definite article "the" with the indefinite article "a", to address the antecedent basis issue.

Claim 24 has been amended as necessary to replace "the second server" with "the first proxy server", thereby correcting the lack of antecedent basis problem.

**Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

As amended, independent claim 1 recites:

1. (Currently Amended) A method for delivering content to a mobile device, comprising the steps of:  
receiving a first request for content from the mobile device;  
responsive to the first request for content, sending to the mobile device an address of the requested content in a reference format;

receiving a second request from the mobile device for the content subsequent to the first request for content, the second request specifying an address of the requested content and a type of the mobile device;

responsive to the second request, fetching the requested content in the reference format from the specified address and converting the fetched content from the reference format to a format suitable to the mobile device, and

delivering the converted content to the mobile device.

According to the claimed invention, a first request for content is received from the mobile device. Responsive thereto, the address of the requested format in a reference format is sent to the mobile device. A second request is then received from the mobile device subsequent to the first request for content, which second request specifies the address of the requested content and the type of mobile device. Responsive to this second request, the requested content is then fetched from the address specified in the second request received from the mobile device, converted into a format suitable to the type of mobile device, and the converted content is delivered to the mobile device.

Hawkins et al. do not teach the claimed steps of receiving the first and second requests from the mobile device. The Hawkins et al. method, as discussed in Columns 13 and 14 as well as Fig. 2, calls for three phases: a distributed web site process, a query process and a response process. The distributed web site process calls for an application to be created to handle requests from mobile devices. Hawkins et al. teach that an application is created for each web site. This allows some static content to be pre-stored on the mobile device and the dynamic portion of the web site to be downloaded to the mobile device upon request. The query process is the second of the three phases. In this phase, the user fills out a query form and submits the form, which initiates the wireless CTP query to the proxy server 180. The proxy server 180 converts the CTP query to HTTP format and forwards the converted query to the web server 140, which completes

the query phase. Note the absence of any step in which a second request for content is received from the mobile device. The response phase (described beginning at Col. 14, line 59) includes the proxy server converting the web server's response into a query response 107, which is then transmitted over the private wireless network 172 to the mobile device, which then incorporates the received response data (the dynamic portion of the requested web site) into the static portion of the web site pre-loaded into the mobile device (see Col. 13, lines 1-9).

Kindly note that Hawkins et al.'s proxy server 180 and the web server 140 do not receive or respond to two requests from the mobile device in order to provide the requested content to the mobile device, as required by the claims. In fact, the Office Action points to the same passage in Hawkins et al. (Column 10, lines 7-13) for an alleged teaching of both requests from the mobile device and the responses thereto.

Hawkins et al. does not teach sending to the mobile device an address of the content in a reference format in combination with fetching the requested content in the reference format from the specified address and converting the fetched content from the reference format to a format suitable to the mobile device responsive to the second request for content from the mobile device. In Hawkins et al., the mobile device makes a single request for content and thereafter receives the requested content, and does not send any second request, as required by the present claims. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection of claim 1 and of its dependent claims are, therefore, respectfully requested.

Amended claim 20 recites:

20. (Currently Amended) A computer system configured to deliver content to a mobile device, comprising:

a first server configured to deliver, responsive to a first request for content from the mobile device, an address of a content in a reference format responsive to a request for the content from the mobile device, and

a first proxy server configured to receive a second request from the mobile device for the content, the second request including the address of the requested content in the reference format and a type of the mobile device, to fetch the content at the received address, to convert the fetched content from the reference format to a format suitable to the type of mobile device and to deliver the converted content to the mobile device.

For reasons similar to those advanced above relative to claim 1 (which are incorporated herein), Hawkins et al. do not teach the claimed first server and the claimed first proxy server. Indeed, Hawkins et al. do not teach the combination of the claimed first server and the claimed first proxy server that are each configured as claimed. That is, neither of Hawkins et al.'s proxy server 180 nor the web server 140 is configured to respond to first and second requests from the mobile device in the manner claimed. For example, Hawkins et al. do not teach the first server delivering an address of the content in a reference format and the first proxy server receiving, from the second request originating from the mobile device, a second request for content, fetching the requested content in the reference format at the received address and converting the fetched content in reference format to a format suitable to the mobile device. Hawkins et al. do not teach a proxy server 180 that receives data from the web server 140 and that converts, but do not teach or suggest the first server and the first proxy server configured as claimed. In Hawkins et al., the servers collectively only receive a single request for content (during the aforementioned query process phase – see Col. 13), in direct contrast to the claimed first and proxy servers in the claimed embodiment. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the §102(e) rejection of claim 20 and of its dependent claims are, therefore, respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

As the §102(e) rejections of the independent claims are deemed to have been overcome, it is not believed necessary to address the §103(a) rejections at this time.


Applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance. If any unresolved issues remain, please contact the undersigned attorney of record at the telephone number indicated below and whatever is necessary to resolve such issues will be done at once.

No additional fees are believed to be due with this communication. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, and to credit any overpayment of fees, which may be required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 15-0635, referencing Docket No. OID-2001-028-01.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Feb 22, 2005

By:

  
Alan W. Young  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 37,970

Young Law Firm, P.C.  
4370 Alpine Rd., Ste. 106  
Portola Valley, CA 94028  
Tel.: (650) 851-7210  
Fax: (650) 851-7232

\V\lfservr\clients\ORCL\5769\5769 AMEND.1.doc